DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 02/12/2010. Claims 38-58 are pending. Claims 1-37 have been cancelled. Claims 38-58 have been added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/12/2010 Remarks regarding claims 51-53 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

3. Applicant's arguments in the 02/12/2010 Remarks regarding claims 38-50 and 54-58 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following:

Regarding claim 38, the applicant argues on pages 8-12 that Lemaire does not teach or suggest that the alert device is configured to illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. It is because, in col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30, Lemaire teaches when the device is downloading messages busy lamp starts blinking (see col.14, lines 25-34). It clearly means that Lemaire teaches the limitation.

Thus, the rejection of the claim will remain. The rejection of the claims 46, 54 and 57 will remain for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 48, the limitation "a selected download frequency to be employed on calendar holidays" was not disclosed in the original specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 38-44, 46, 54, 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Lemaire et al**. (U.S. 5,444,768).

Regarding claims 38, 46, with respect to Figures 1A and 2, **Lemaire** teaches an electronic document answering machine comprising:

a central processing unit (CPU) 40 (col.8, lines 18-22);

Lemaire further teaches a communication interface, wherein the electronic document answering machine is configured to access at least one remote source via the communication interface (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30);

Lemaire further teaches a memory 15, 54-58, configured to store at least one new document received from the at least one remote source based on at least accessing the at least one remote source (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.7, lines 6-21, col.8, lines 18-22, col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30);

Lemaire further teaches an alert device comprising a light emitting device, wherein the alert device is configured to illuminate the light emitting device based on at least the at least one new document being received and stored in the memory of the electronic document answering machine and not yet reviewed (fig.6, steps 140, 142, 144, 148; col.5, lines 36-66, col.14, lines 25-34, col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30); and

Lemaire further teaches a rendering apparatus configured to render a stored document of the at least one new document (fig.2; labels 13 and 20; col.7, lines 6-21, col.9, lines 18-31).

Regarding claim 39, **Lemaire** teaches the electric document answering machine of claim 38 wherein the system for rendering stored documents comprises a speaker and voice synthesis apparatus (fig.4).

Regarding claim 40, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 38, wherein the rendering apparatus comprises a display apparatus (col.9, lines 64-68).

Regarding claim 41, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 38, wherein the electronic document answering machine further comprises a port configured to enable communication between the electronic document answering machine and a host personal computer (PC), wherein the electronic document answering machine is configured to transmit the stored document to the PC, and wherein the communication interface is a modem and wherein the electronic document answering machine is configured to provide modem functionality for use by the PC (fig.6, labels 130, 134; col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30).

Regarding claim 42, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 38, wherein wherein the at least one remote source includes an Internet mail server, and the stored document includes at least one addressed e-mail message received from the Internet mail server (col.2, lines 40-45, col.3, lines 42-46, 60-63).

Regarding claim 43, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 38, further comprising a first pushbutton including the light emitting device and configured to initiate rendering of the stored document, wherein the light emitting device includes a light emitting diode (fig.1A, labels 38,33).

Regarding claim 44, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 43, further comprising a second pushbutton configured to control an application of power to one or more power-using elements of the electronic document answering machine (fig.1A, labels 30,32,34 or 36).

Regarding claims 54, 57 and 58, with respect to Figures 1A and 2, **Lemaire** teaches a computing device, comprising:

a retriever configured to access one or more remote sources and retrieve and store in memory of the computing device at least one new digital document addressed to an addressee associated with the computing device (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.14, lines 3-24); and

Lemaire further teaches an input device having at least one light emitting device included in the input device, wherein the at least one light emitting device is configured to become illuminated based on at least the at least one new digital document being stored in the

memory of, and ready for review at, the computing device (fig.1A, labels 38,33; col.5, lines 36-66, col.7, lines 6-21, col.14, lines 25-34, col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lemaire et al.** (U.S. 5,444,768).

Regarding claim 45, **Lemaire** teaches a third one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is designated for voice messages (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.14, line 66-col.15, line 30);

However, **Lemaire** does not teach that the electronic document answering machine further comprises a plurality of programmable mail boxes, wherein a first one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is designated for fax messages, a second one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is designated for World Wide Web pages. Examiner notes that the electronic document answering machine further comprising a plurality of programmable mail boxes, wherein a first one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is designated for fax messages, a second one of the plurality of programmable mail boxes is designated for World Wide Web pages is well known in the art. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add different mailboxes to **Lemaire**'s invention in order to provide flexible storage capabilities for different kind of messages.

11. Claims 47-50, 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lemaire et al**. (U.S. 5,444,768) in view of **Clark et al.** (U.S. 5,666,530).

Regarding claims 47, 48, 55 and 56, **Lemaire** teaches means for initializing, wherein the means for initializing includes the means for providing a light emitting device alert and wherein the means for initializing is configured to signal the electronic document answering system to initiate review of the one or more new digital documents that have been retrieved and stored and are ready for review (fig.1A, labels 38,33; col.5, lines 36-66);and

However, **Lemaire** does not teach the following limitations:

"means for operating code provided for the electronic document answering system if the PC is in reduced-power mode and if the PC is in full power operating mode, wherein the means for operating code is configured to base operation on a first download frequency if the PC is operating in the full power operating mode and a second download frequency if the PC is operating in the reduced-power mode, the first download frequency being greater than the second download frequency, and the second download frequency being indicative of one or more rules associated with a time of day, time of month or time of year of operation of the electronic document answering system"

Clark teaches means for operating code provided for the electronic document answering system if the PC is in reduced-power mode and if the PC is in full power operating mode, wherein the means for operating code is configured to base operation on a first download frequency if the PC is operating in the full power operating mode and a second download frequency if the PC is operating in the reduced-power mode, the first download frequency being greater than the second download frequency, and the second download frequency being indicative of one or more rules associated with a time of day, time of month or time of year of operation of the electronic document answering system (col.5, lines 24-37 and 65-col.6, line 15). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add power-down capabilities to **Lemaire**'s invention for providing reduced power consumption as taught by **Clark**'s invention in order to provide flexible operation capabilities.

Regarding claim 49, **Lemaire** teaches the system of claim 47, further comprising a means for receiving input, wherein the means for providing the light emitting device alert and the means for initializing are in the means for receiving input, and wherein the means for receiving input is communicatively coupled with the PC (fig.1A).

Regarding claim 50, **Lemaire** teaches the system of claim 49, wherein the means for providing the light emitting device alert is a light emitting diode in a keyboard, and the means for initializing is a key on the means for receiving input (fig.1A, labels 38, 33).

12. Claims 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cooper et al**. (U.S. 6,052,442) in view of **Perlman et al.** (U.S. 5,896,444).

Regarding claims 51 and 52, with respect to Figures 1-3, **Cooper** teaches computing device, comprising:

a communication apparatus configured to interface to at least one network store of electronic documents to receive a new set of electronic documents having a delivery address associated with the computing device (fig.6, label 106; col.1, lines 20-29, col.4, lines 37-43, 59-67);

Cooper further teaches a memory configured to store the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address (fig.6, label 106; col.1, lines 20-29, col.4, lines 37-43);

Cooper further teaches an alert device configured to render text based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address (fig. 2B, labels 25, 26; col.6, lines 19-29); and

Cooper further teaches an input device configured to request rendering of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address (col.4, lines 43-47, col.7, lines 15-20).

Cooper does not teach the following limitations,

"an alert device configured to render video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address, wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television configured to display rendered video"

Periman teaches an alert device configured to render video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address, wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television configured to display rendered video (Col. 4, lines 16-20, Col. 7, line 63-Col. 8, line 11). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of an alert device configured to render video based on at least receipt of the new set of electronic documents having the delivery address, wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television configured to display rendered video to **Cooper**'s invention for accessing messaging facilities as taught by **Perlman**'s invention in order to provide a display of video message in a larger screen so that user can enjoy watching message in big display.

Regarding claim 53, **Cooper** teaches receiving a request to render at least one of the one or more new electronic documents and transferring the at least one of the one or more new

electronic documents to a computing device for further processing, wherein the transferring is performed based on at least the request to render the at least one of the one or more new electronic documents, wherein the transferring includes transferring the at least one of the one or more new electronic documents to a computing device for display of the at least one of the one or more new electronic documents by the computing device (col.1, lines 20-29, col.4, lines 37-43, col.8, lines 6-12).

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MD S. ELAHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FAN TSANG can be reached on (571)272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MD S ELAHEE/

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614
July 11, 2012